Supplemental Method 1. Amino acid database for food items of the French INCA3 survey.

An amino acid (AA) database was developed for the 1761 food items in the full repertoire of adults in the INCA3 study, using both the method described here and the database developed by de Gavelle *et al.* [1].

AA content databases

The AA contents of different food items were collected from published French sources [2] and international databases [3]. These data came from analytical data on AA obtained using automated AA analyzers (involving ion-exchange chromatography) or high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC).

Assignment to INCA3 food items

To assign the AA contents of the foods analyzed to INCA3 food items, we used the following procedure:

Step 1: Direct analytical data from French published sources
Very few analyses had been performed on French foods using chromatographic methods to analyze 18 AAs. Data from a study on the nutritional value of meat by the *Centre d'Information des Viandes* were used for most of the beef, veal, lamb, horse meat and offal food items [2].

Step 2: Data based on "similar" food items
When no direct analytical data corresponded to INCA3 food items, assignments were made using "similar" food items. Firstly, if data were available on a different form of the same food (*e.g.,* cooked and not raw), we hypothesized that the AA profiles of the proteins were not modified by the cooking processes, and that the data for the different forms of the same food were assigned to the INCA3 food items. Then, if data were unavailable for a food item but existed for similar species (*e.g.,* food from different cuts of the same animal), we assigned the similar food to the INCA3 food item. In order to compare AA profiles between different foods, we conducted our analyses in mg per gram of total nitrogen (mg/g of N).

Step 3: Use of recipes to break down mixed food items
Mixed INCA3 food items for which no data were found (*e.g.,* chili con carne or lasagna) were broken down into ingredients using the INCA3 recipe table. The food item AA content was calculated as a combination of the AA contents of its ingredients.

Step 4: Assignment to 0 for foods containing very little or no protein
The AA content of some INCA3 food items was assigned to 0 as these foods contained very low or no protein levels (*e.g.,* oil or alcoholic beverages).

Calculation of the AA contents of foods

We used the 2016 nutritional composition database from the French *Centre d'Information sur la Qualité des Aliments* (CIQUAL) [4] for protein content, which we multiplied by the AA contents (in mg/g of N) of the databases from which the data were borrowed. The CIQUAL table expresses protein content in g/100 g of food. For database matching, a conversion was therefore necessary and was carried out using the following formula: AA (mg/100 g of food) = AA (mg/g of N) * protein (g/100 g of food) / Jones' factor (N-to-protein conversion factor).

The Jones' factor used is from the USDA database [3].

Supplemental Method 2. Methodological approach for the evaluation of diet environmental impacts.

The environmental pressures associated with the observed and modeled diets were estimated by indicators resulting from the matching of the 2497 food items consumed in France with those of the French database Agribalyse® 3.0.1, developed by the French Agency for the Environment and Energy Management (ADEME) [5].

Environmental indicator estimations are based on the method of Life Cycle Assessment (LCA), the scope of which is "from field to plate". The perimeter of the indicators covers each process of the value chain (production of raw materials, transport, transformation, packaging, distribution and retailing, preparation at the consumer's place and disposal of packaging) and these processes have been split into two phases: 1) production and 2) post-farm. Of note, losses and wastes (other than the non-edible parts) at home, as well as transport from the retail to the household, have not been considered.

Overall, the method is based on the international LCA standards: ISO 14040 [6] and ISO 14044 [7], LEAP guidelines [8] and PEF [9], and the finalized indicators are provided per kg of product and are detailed per process.

For the agricultural phase of plant products, all upstream processes (notably input production) excluding storage or drying are included except for ingredients in processed food. In the case of animal products, all operations including the phases of production, transport and storage of feed, fattening of animals, milking, construction and maintenance of buildings and machinery have been considered. The scope chosen is consistent with those defined in GESTIM [10] and ecoinvent® [11].

The LCI (Life Cycle Inventory) data of AGRIBALYSE v3.0.1 covered the period 2005-2009, except for perennial crops (2000-2010). The variety of production systems was considered by applying coefficients based on the share of systems in national production. The allocation rules are varied and are based on international recommendations as described by the ISO 14040/14044 standards [6,7]. In particular, allocations have been developed in order to distribute organic nitrogen fertilizers and mineral fertilizers (P and K) between crop sequences. Biophysical allocations were used for animal production (milk *versus* meat). The biophysical models used for animal production and allocations by type of productions are presented in the full report [12] according to the reference AFNOR-BPX 30-323 [13] and in compliance with the ISO 14044 standard [7] according to three rules in descending order: 1) avoid allocation, 2) biophysic allocation and 3) economic allocation.

A characterization method recommended by the European Commission (Environmental Footprint 3.0) translates the input and output flows of the inventory into impacts. For the background data (inputs in construction, raw materials, etc.) the ecoinvent® database is used to assess the indirect emissions (off-field emissions). The full methodology and methodological choices have been described elsewhere [12].

The transition from commodities to food as consumed introduced coefficients related to the edible part and economic allocations between co-products. The recipes were disaggregated into ingredients, and for feasibility reasons, a threshold of 95% of the ingredients covered was used. Similarly, for the origin of the ingredients, a threshold of 70% coverage was used, followed by a standardization step. The whole methodology and methodological adoptions have been described elsewhere [14] and post-farm estimations are aligned on the PEF guidelines [9].

A total of 14 midpoint indicators are available: climate change, ozone depletion, particulate matters, ionizing radiation (effect on human health), ecotoxicity, photochemical ozone formation (effect on human health), acidification, terrestrial eutrophication, freshwater eutrophication, marine eutrophication, land use, water use, Resource use, minerals and metals and Resource use, fossils. In addition, the EF 3 (environmental footprint) single score is provided, which includes these 14 indicators together with 2 further indicators related to human toxicity. The normalization and weighting factors considered in the calculation of the EF 3 score have been extensively described [9].

Concerning the indicators for food as consumed, and according to the guidelines of the PEF method [9], a quality indicator (DQR) is provided and the AGRIBALYSE 3.0 database has been reviewed and criticized by RIVM and GreenDelta as well as by French agricultural and agri-food technical institutes "Peter Koch Consulting".

Supplemental Table 1. Lowest and highest adequate values of the percentage of plant protein in the diet (%PP) and corresponding limiting nutrients in modeled diets obtained by long-term health risk minimization when considering all the constraints on nutrient and food group intakes or only those on nutrient intakes in French males and females[1].

	Lowest adequate %PP value	Highest adequate %PP value	
		82% in males	77% in females
Main model with all the constraints on nutrient and food group intakes	16% in both sexes Fiber - Sugar (excluding lactose) + Saturated fatty acids + Atherogenic fatty acids +	Iodine - Sodium + Vitamin B12 - Calcium - Vitamin A - EPA+DHA - Vitamin B2 - α-linolenic acid -	Iodine - Sodium + Bioavailable iron - Vitamin B2 - Calcium - EPA+DHA - α-linolenic acid - Vitamin A -
Alternative model without the constraints on food group intakes (tested during sensitivity analysis)	8% in both sexes Fiber - Sugar (excluding lactose) + Protein + Sodium + Vitamin B9 - Vitamin C - Manganese -	94% in males Vitamin B12 - Sodium + EPA+DHA - Vitamin A - Copper + Selenium +	92% in females Iodine - EPA+DHA - Sodium + Vitamin B12 - Vitamin B2 -

[1]In each considered case of a modeled diet with an extreme %PP value, the associated limiting nutrients (i.e., the nutrients with a non-null dual value) are listed from the most to the least limiting (i.e., from the higher to the lower absolute standardized dual value), and the limiting nutrients followed by a plus or minus sign are those being close to be excessively or insufficiently supplied, respectively (i.e., having reached their upper or lower limit, respectively).
In the alternative model (with the nutritional constraints, only, and not the dietary and acceptability constraints), limiting nutrients on a grey background are those that need to be removed from the nutritional constraints to allow model convergence for more extreme %PP values, up to diets with %PP=0% or 100%. To allow for %PP≤8%, it was thus necessary to waive nutritional adequacy in fiber for %PP≤7% and in vitamin C, sodium, manganese and protein for %PP≤1%, while to allow for %PP≥92%, it was necessary to waive nutritional adequacy in vitamin B12 and EPA+DHA for %PP≥95% and 97%, respectively, in males, and in iodine, vitamin B12 and EPA+DHA for %PP≥93%, 94% and 96%, respectively, in females.
Atherogenic fatty acids, lauric and myristic and palmitic acids; DHA, docosahexaenoic acid; EPA, eicosapentaenoic acid.

Supplemental Table 2. Energy intake and food category consumption in observed (Obs) and modeled diets obtained by long-term health risk and diet departure minimization under imposed percentage of plant protein in the diet (%PP) in French males and females[1].

	Males																Females													
	Obs diet	Modeled diets															Obs diet	Modeled diets													
%PP	33%	16%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	50%	55%	60%	65%	70%	75%	80%	82%	34%	16%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	50%	55%	60%	65%	70%	75%	77%
Energy intake (kcal):	2 731	2 470	2 470	2 486	2 470	2 470	2 470	2 470	2 470	2 470	2 470	2 470	2 633	2 730	2 581	2 603	2 024	2 205	2 110	2 042	1 995	1 995	1 995	1 995	1 995	1 995	2 092	2 205	2 205	2 205	2 205
Food category consumption (g/day)[2]:																															
Processed meat	50	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Red meat	79	71	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	42	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poultry	30	108	108	108	108	108	103	72	49	30	10	0	0	0	0	0	31	109	109	109	109	93	70	51	26	4	0	0	0	0	0
Dairy products	233	678	854	840	808	695	590	569	539	505	508	544	486	404	42	0	208	592	745	720	571	507	465	429	425	431	432	423	393	116	86
Milk	*84*	*486*	*486*	*486*	*486*	*486*	*486*	*486*	*486*	*486*	*486*	*486*	*486*	*404*	*42*	*0*	*75*	*393*	*393*	*393*	*393*	*393*	*393*	*393*	*393*	*393*	*393*	*393*	*393*	*77*	*56*
Eggs	14	61	61	61	61	41	20	16	12	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	14	70	70	70	48	34	32	29	28	28	13	0	0	0	0
Seafood	36	67	67	67	41	21	21	22	22	22	25	25	26	31	41	31	25	65	65	65	45	45	46	43	44	42	43	41	34	46	41
Oily fishes	*8*	*26*	*26*	*26*	*26*	*21*	*21*	*22*	*22*	*22*	*22*	*22*	*22*	*21*	*19*	*20*	*6*	*26*	*26*	*25*	*20*	*21*	*21*	*21*	*21*	*22*	*22*	*22*	*24*	*20*	*21*
Other fishes	*22*	*13*	*13*	*13*	*13*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*15*	*13*	*13*	*14*	*19*	*18*	*16*	*10*	*6*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*
Mollusks & crustaceans	*5*	*28*	*28*	*28*	*2*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*	*3*	*4*	*4*	*10*	*22*	*11*	*4*	*26*	*26*	*26*	*6*	*6*	*9*	*12*	*17*	*20*	*21*	*19*	*10*	*11*	*20*
Fruits & Vegetables	318	854	854	721	804	827	838	843	845	843	839	854	854	854	854	798	283	746	746	641	710	696	688	684	684	684	730	746	746	746	746
Fruits	*142*	*453*	*453*	*383*	*453*	*453*	*453*	*453*	*453*	*453*	*453*	*453*	*453*	*453*	*453*	*397*	*124*	*359*	*359*	*359*	*359*	*315*	*301*	*297*	*297*	*297*	*343*	*359*	*359*	*359*	*359*
Vegetables	*176*	*400*	*400*	*339*	*351*	*374*	*385*	*390*	*391*	*390*	*386*	*400*	*400*	*400*	*400*	*400*	*160*	*387*	*387*	*282*	*351*	*381*	*387*	*387*	*387*	*387*	*387*	*387*	*387*	*387*	*387*
Legumes & Nuts	17	0	51	123	123	123	123	123	123	123	123	127	127	127	127	127	8	0	22	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	101	101	101	101	101
Legumes	*13*	*0*	*51*	*107*	*107*	*107*	*107*	*107*	*107*	*107*	*107*	*107*	*107*	*107*	*107*	*107*	*6*	*0*	*22*	*87*	*87*	*87*	*87*	*87*	*87*	*87*	*87*	*87*	*87*	*87*	*87*
Nuts	*3*	*0*	*0*	*16*	*16*	*16*	*16*	*16*	*16*	*16*	*16*	*20*	*20*	*20*	*20*	*20*	*2*	*0*	*0*	*13*	*13*	*13*	*13*	*13*	*13*	*13*	*14*	*14*	*14*	*14*	*14*
Refined grain products	266	0	0	0	0	13	58	61	79	100	109	214	247	230	227	218	186	0	0	0	0	25	33	33	25	13	74	147	165	145	138
Whole grain products	14	28	170	170	171	170	170	170	170	170	170	170	170	282	170	170	19	70	137	137	137	137	137	137	137	137	137	137	170	137	137
Potatoes & starch	106	264	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	273	263	284	316	71	169	85	0	0	0	11	28	39	56	94	178	224	267	278
Added fats	58	33	33	92	140	146	152	153	155	156	158	152	129	53	53	29	53	25	31	89	100	110	113	113	111	108	112	110	22	32	18
Miscellaneous foods	192	70	60	14	58	59	77	98	103	108	103	93	48	61	229	227	174	39	39	29	44	61	78	92	107	115	88	46	151	224	247
Sweetened beverages	221	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	208	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	116
Other drinks	1 717	1 372	1 393	878	989	805	859	884	916	942	961	811	712	803	3104	3 641	1 495	1 433	1 941	1 386	810	836	887	870	914	861	793	595	500	2 523	2 749
Relative changes compared to observed diet (%)[2]:																															
Processed meat		-90	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100		-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100
Red meat		-10	-72	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-90		67	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100
Poultry		256	256	256	256	256	237	136	62	-1	-68	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100		248	248	248	248	196	123	62	-18	-86	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100
Dairy products		191	266	260	247	198	153	144	131	117	118	133	108	73	-82	-100		185	258	246	174	144	123	106	104	107	108	103	89	-44	-59
Milk		*479*	*479*	*479*	*479*	*479*	*479*	*479*	*479*	*479*	*479*	*479*	*479*	*381*	*-50*	*-100*		*421*	*421*	*421*	*421*	*421*	*421*	*421*	*421*	*421*	*421*	*421*	*421*	*2*	*-26*
Eggs		336	336	336	336	190	42	16	-15	-20	-51	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100		410	410	409	251	149	133	114	101	102	-5	-100	-100	-100	-100
Seafood		87	87	87	14	-41	-40	-40	-39	-38	-31	-29	-27	-13	15	-13		160	160	160	81	80	83	70	75	67	71	65	35	84	64
Oily fishes		*209*	*209*	*209*	*209*	*148*	*152*	*156*	*159*	*160*	*160*	*156*	*159*	*155*	*124*	*143*		*331*	*331*	*319*	*233*	*241*	*240*	*252*	*250*	*258*	*258*	*266*	*295*	*316*	*251*
Other fishes		*-42*	*-42*	*-42*	*-42*	*-100*	*-100*	*-100*	*-100*	*-100*	*-100*	*-100*	*-100*	*-100*	*-100*	*-100*		*-16*	*-16*	*-11*	*23*	*19*	*7*	*-38*	*-59*	*-100*	*-100*	*-100*	*-100*	*-100*	*-100*
Mollusks & crustaceans		*459*	*459*	*459*	*-69*	*-100*	*-100*	*-100*	*-100*	*-92*	*-44*	*-23*	*-11*	*96*	*350*	*117*		*606*	*606*	*606*	*73*	*71*	*145*	*222*	*346*	*445*	*472*	*419*	*171*	*196*	*440*
Fruits & Vegetables		168	168	127	153	160	163	165	165	165	164	168	168	168	168	151		163	163	126	151	146	143	141	141	141	158	163	163	163	163
Fruits		*219*	*219*	*169*	*219*	*219*	*218*	*218*	*219*	*219*	*218*	*219*	*219*	*219*	*219*	*179*		*191*	*191*	*191*	*191*	*155*	*144*	*140*	*141*	*140*	*178*	*191*	*191*	*191*	*191*
Vegetables		*128*	*128*	*93*	*99*	*113*	*119*	*122*	*123*	*122*	*120*	*128*	*128*	*128*	*128*	*128*		*142*	*142*	*76*	*120*	*138*	*142*	*142*	*142*	*142*	*142*	*142*	*142*	*142*	*142*
Legumes & Nuts		-100	206	643	646	644	644	644	644	644	644	667	668	668	668	668		-100	173	1 131	1 131	1 131	1 131	1 133	1 131	1 131	1 147	1 147	1 147	1 147	1 147
Legumes		*-100*	*276*	*696*	*696*	*696*	*696*	*696*	*696*	*696*	*696*	*696*	*696*	*696*	*696*	*696*		*-100*	*276*	*1374*	*1374*	*1374*	*1374*	*1374*	*1374*	*1374*	*1374*	*1374*	*1374*	*1374*	*1374*
Nuts		*-100*	*-100*	*414*	*433*	*419*	*418*	*418*	*418*	*422*	*419*	*545*	*548*	*548*	*548*	*548*		*-100*	*-100*	*486*	*486*	*485*	*485*	*493*	*487*	*486*	*543*	*543*	*543*	*543*	*543*
Refined grain products		-100	-100	-100	-100	-95	-78	-77	-70	-63	-59	-19	-7	-13	-14	-18		-100	-100	-100	-100	-87	-82	-82	-87	-93	-61	-21	-12	-22	-26
Whole grain products		91	1 075	1 076	1 081	1 075	1 075	1 075	1 075	1075	1 075	1 075	1 075	1 846	1 075	1 077		262	611	611	611	611	611	611	611	611	611	611	779	611	611
Potatoes & starch		150	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-62	158	149	169	199		139	21	-100	-100	-100	-85	-61	-44	-21	32	151	216	278	294
Added fats		-43	-43	60	142	153	163	164	168	171	174	163	124	-8	-9	-49		-52	-41	69	91	109	116	115	111	106	113	110	-59	-40	-65
Miscellaneous foods		-64	-69	-93	-70	-70	-60	-49	-46	-44	-47	-52	-75	-68	19	18		-78	-77	-83	-75	-65	-55	-47	-39	-34	-49	-73	-13	29	42
Sweetened beverages		-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100		-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-100	-91	-44
Other drinks		-20	-19	-49	-42	-53	-50	-49	-47	-45	-44	-53	-59	-53	81	112		-4	30	-7	-46	-44	-41	-42	-39	-42	-47	-60	-67	69	84

[1]Observed data from the third Individual and National Study on Food Consumption French Survey (INCA3), n=1125 (564 males, 561 females).

[2] For clarity, the 45 modeled food groups are not represented here but grouped into broader categories (see Supplemental Table 5 for details about food grouping). Consumption data on a black background are those having been zeroed, and consumption data on a grey background are those having been raised to their maximal values, as set in the acceptability constraints (see Supplemental Table 7 for details about these consumption limits).

Supplemental Table 3. Protein and amino acid intakes in observed (Obs) and modeled diets obtained by long-term health risk and diet departure minimization under the imposed percentage of plant protein in the diet (%PP) in French adults[1].

	Obs diet	Modeled diets														EAR[3]	98% safe intake (=EAR +2*SD)
%PP	33%	16%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	50%	55%	60%	65%	70%	75%	77%		
Intakes (mg·kgBW^{-1}·d^{-1})[2]:																	
Aspartic acid + asparagine	109	176	157	155	141	128	120	111	102	95	93	96	105	106	104	-	-
Alanine	60	88	79	78	70	64	59	53	48	43	41	42	43	44	43	-	-
Arginine	68	98	89	92	84	76	71	65	59	54	52	54	56	59	58	-	-
Methionine + Cysteine	49	67	60	58	52	47	44	40	36	33	32	33	35	35	33	15	19
Methionine	*31*	*46*	*41*	*39*	*34*	*30*	*27*	*24*	*22*	*20*	*18*	*18*	*19*	*18*	*17*	*-*	*-*
Cysteine	*18*	*20*	*19*	*19*	*18*	*17*	*16*	*15*	*14*	*14*	*14*	*14*	*16*	*17*	*16*	*-*	*-*
Glutamic acid + glutamine	257	306	303	304	284	268	256	242	230	220	219	233	249	244	231	-	-
Glycine	50	71	62	63	57	52	50	45	41	38	36	38	39	41	40	-	-
Histidine	36	50	47	46	42	38	35	31	28	26	25	25	26	25	24	10	12
Isoleucine	55	80	76	75	67	60	55	50	46	43	41	42	43	42	40	20	25
Leucine	98	141	134	132	119	107	99	90	82	76	73	75	78	75	72	39	48
Lysine	83	135	125	121	108	96	86	76	67	59	55	54	55	53	50	30	37
Phenylalanine + Tyrosine	99	145	138	135	120	108	100	92	85	79	76	79	82	79	75	25	31
Phenylalanine	*56*	*78*	*74*	*74*	*67*	*61*	*57*	*53*	*49*	*47*	*45*	*47*	*50*	*49*	*47*	*-*	*-*
Tyrosine	*43*	*67*	*64*	*61*	*53*	*47*	*43*	*39*	*35*	*32*	*31*	*31*	*32*	*30*	*29*	*-*	*-*
Proline	88	108	109	106	96	89	84	80	76	74	74	78	82	78	73	-	-
Serine	58	84	81	81	73	66	61	57	53	51	49	50	52	51	48	-	-
Threonine	50	74	68	66	59	53	49	45	41	37	36	37	38	37	36	15	19
Tryptophan	15	21	21	20	18	16	15	14	13	12	11	12	12	12	12	4	5
Valine	65	95	90	88	78	70	65	60	55	51	49	51	53	52	49	26	32
Protein	1 240	1 742	1 617	1 598	1 462	1 334	1 245	1 145	1 060	987	956	993	1 048	1 020	980	660	818
Deviations from the 98% safe intake threshold (%)[4]:																	
Methionine + Cysteine	157%	252%	214%	203%	174%	149%	130%	109%	91%	76%	**68%**	72%	83%	83%	74%		
Histidine	199%	313%	288%	281%	246%	213%	189%	162%	137%	116%	107%	112%	119%	112%	**101%**		
Isoleucine	122%	221%	205%	199%	168%	141%	122%	102%	85%	70%	63%	68%	74%	69%	**61%**		
Leucine	105%	194%	179%	175%	148%	123%	106%	87%	72%	58%	52%	57%	63%	57%	**50%**		
Lysine	124%	265%	238%	227%	192%	158%	133%	106%	82%	61%	49%	47%	50%	43%	**35%**		
Phenylalanine + Tyrosine	220%	368%	345%	336%	288%	249%	222%	196%	174%	155%	146%	154%	163%	154%	**143%**		
Threonine	163%	289%	258%	247%	212%	181%	160%	135%	114%	96%	**87%**	92%	100%	97%	90%		
Tryptophan	206%	330%	313%	303%	258%	224%	201%	176%	155%	137%	**130%**	138%	148%	148%	136%		
Valine	102%	195%	180%	174%	145%	120%	103%	86%	72%	60%	55%	60%	67%	62%	**54**%		
Protein	52%	113%	98%	95%	79%	63%	52%	40%	30%	21%	**17**%	21%	28%	25%	20%		

[1]Observed data from the third Individual and National Study on Food Consumption French Survey (INCA3), n=1125 (564 males, 561 females). Observed and modeled diets in French adults (mean of males and females).

[2]To account for the slightly lower average digestibility of plant protein, protein intake from plants was reduced by 5% when calculating total protein and amino acid intakes (see the Methods section).

[3]EAR, Estimated average requirement of adults for protein and indispensable amino acids, based on the Joint FAO/WHO/UNU Expert Consultation on Protein and Amino Acid Requirements in Human Nutrition (2002) [15].

[4]Over all the observed and modeled diets, individual indispensable amino acid and protein intakes were always higher than the corresponding 98% safe intake, the minimum deviation from this threshold value being indicated in bold.

Supplemental Table 4. Daily intakes of energy and nutrients in observed (Obs) and modeled diets obtained by long-term health risk and diet departure minimization under imposed percentage of plant protein in the diet (%PP) in French males and females[1,2].

		Males																Females													
		Obs diet	Modeled diets															Obs diet	Modeled diets												
%PP		33%	16%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	50%	55%	60%	65%	70%	75%	80%	82%	34%	16%	20%	25%	30%	35%	40%	45%	50%	55%	60%	65%	70%	75%	77%
Units (/day)																															
Energy intake	kcal	**2 731**	2 470	2 470	2 486	2 470	2 470	2 470	2 470	2 470	2 470	2 470	2 470	2 633	2 730	2 581	2 603	2 024	2 205	2 110	2 042	1 995	1 995	1 995	1 995	1 995	1 995	2 092	2 205	2 205	2 205	2 205
Vitamin A	µg	805	815	841	764	750	750	750	750	750	750	750	750	750	750	750	750	**608**	2016	751	654	650	650	650	650	650	650	650	650	650	650	650
Vitamin B1	µg/kcal	0.54	0.59	0.63	0.61	0.67	0.64	0.62	0.60	0.59	0.57	0.56	0.58	0.61	0.59	0.56	0.57	0.56	0.63	0.67	0.71	0.67	0.65	0.64	0.63	0.63	0.63	0.64	0.66	0.72	0.66	0.70
Vitamin B2	mg	2.17	3.20	3.55	3.14	2.92	2.58	2.28	2.17	2.07	1.95	1.91	1.84	1.80	1.70	1.60	1.60	1.66	3.29	3.05	3.01	2.29	2.05	1.92	1.82	1.79	1.80	1.78	1.77	1.79	1.60	1.60
Vitamin B3[3]	mg NE/kcal	0.016	0.021	0.019	0.017	0.017	0.016	0.015	0.014	0.013	0.011	0.010	0.011	0.012	0.012	0.013	0.013	0.016	0.023	0.020	0.021	0.019	0.017	0.016	0.014	0.013	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.013	0.014	0.014
Vitamin B5	mg	6.9	9.6	9.9	9.2	9.4	8.7	8.1	7.6	7.2	6.9	6.6	6.6	7.5	7.4	6.6	6.8	5.3	9.5	9.3	9.1	7.7	7.2	6.8	6.5	6.3	6.2	6.4	7.0	7.5	6.8	7.0
Vitamin B6	mg	2.1	3.0	2.3	2.2	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.9	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.4	**1.5**	2.7	2.3	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.8	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.4
Vitamin B9	µg	347	438	496	503	548	524	511	510	506	503	498	527	563	565	543	534	**280**	500	460	489	457	448	445	445	448	455	477	507	539	534	556
Vitamin B12	µg	6.2	10.6	9.8	9.2	6.4	5.1	4.7	4.4	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.1	18.5	9.0	8.7	5.5	5.1	5.1	5.1	5.5	5.8	5.8	5.5	4.5	5.3	4.6
Vitamin C	mg	**98**	158	146	115	154	156	157	158	158	158	158	163	182	178	177	150	**84**	144	137	127	131	126	126	127	129	131	145	156	164	172	193
Vitamin D	µg	3.5	5.4	6.4	6.6	6.7	5.4	4.7	4.5	4.3	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.5	2.9	2.1	1.8	2.9	5.6	6.1	6.3	5.1	4.6	4.3	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.5	3.3	2.9	2.1	1.9
Vitamin E	mg	13	18	18	18	19	19	19	19	19	20	20	19	19	16	18	17	11	16	15	14	15	15	15	15	16	16	16	17	14	16	15
Vitamin K1	µg	118	278	263	238	205	226	230	232	234	236	241	251	256	249	267	305	111	231	237	193	213	223	225	226	228	229	238	243	237	251	262
Calcium	mg	1 065	1 618	1 817	1 646	1 495	1 316	1 210	1 199	1 172	1 143	1 147	1 204	1 150	1 084	950	950	**892**	1 552	1 711	1 505	1 239	1 123	1 066	1 037	1 054	1 068	1 069	1 044	1 025	950	950
Copper	mg	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.3	2.6	2.8	2.9	1.6	4.2	2.0	2.0	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.5	2.5
Bioavailable iron[4]	mg	1.68	1.80	1.37	1.25	1.23	1.24	1.19	1.16	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.19	1.14	1.19	1.21	2.12	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16
Oral iron	mg	*13*	*14*	*13*	*12*	*12*	*12*	*12*	*12*	*12*	*12*	*12*	*13*	*13*	*14*	*15*	*16*	*10*	*16*	*12*	*13*	*11*	*11*	*11*	*11*	*12*	*12*	*12*	*13*	*13*	*15*	*15*
Iron absorption	%	*13%*	*13%*	*10%*	*10%*	*10%*	*10%*	*10%*	*10%*	*9%*	*9%*	*9%*	*9%*	*9%*	*9%*	*8%*	*8%*	*12%*	*13%*	*9%*	*9%*	*11%*	*11%*	*10%*	*10%*	*10%*	*10%*	*10%*	*9%*	*9%*	*8%*	*8%*
Iodine	µg	175	253	265	249	226	190	171	167	163	159	156	164	165	150	150	150	**145**	238	248	238	177	162	157	150	150	150	150	150	150	150	150
Magnesium	mg	409	487	527	457	480	463	462	455	453	446	445	471	495	531	572	560	330	471	498	502	401	393	393	393	396	398	415	429	442	522	529
Manganese	mg	3.6	2.9	4.0	3.5	4.0	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.9	5.3	5.6	6.7	6.0	5.9	3.1	3.3	3.7	4.1	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.9	4.1	4.2	4.5	4.9	5.5	5.6	5.7
Phosphorus	mg	1 483	1 961	2 061	2 041	1 942	1 785	1 689	1 615	1 547	1 490	1 444	1 514	1 600	1 664	1 241	1 214	1 128	1 909	1 878	1 839	1 680	1 552	1 463	1 402	1 356	1 323	1 347	1 393	1 452	1 194	1 184
Potassium	mg	3 736	5 917	4 922	4 334	4 686	4 558	4 454	4 357	4 290	4 187	4 152	4 350	5 226	5 154	5 026	4 780	**2 906**	5 380	4 974	4 536	3 905	3 789	3 747	3 711	3 710	3 725	3 935	4 207	4 252	4 537	4 656
Selenium	µg	146	178	179	164	152	133	135	132	130	129	128	138	141	139	192	211	120	166	171	154	133	130	128	122	120	114	119	121	125	171	181
Sodium	mg	**3 938**	2 300	2 300	2 294	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300	**3 100**	2 300	2 297	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300	2 300
Bioavailable zinc[4]	mg	3.77	4.47	4.39	4.07	3.71	3.37	3.15	2.99	2.84	2.71	2.62	2.67	2.61	2.62	2.32	2.18	3.15	4.39	4.14	3.93	3.41	3.13	2.97	2.85	2.80	2.75	2.69	2.59	2.46	2.40	2.28
Oral zinc	mg	*12.1*	*15.1*	*14.2*	*12.9*	*11.1*	*10.3*	*9.8*	*9.3*	*9.0*	*8.7*	*8.5*	*9.0*	*9.2*	*10.0*	*9.1*	*8.8*	*8.8*	*14.6*	*12.6*	*12.4*	*9.9*	*9.2*	*8.9*	*8.8*	*8.8*	*8.8*	*9.0*	*9.2*	*9.0*	*9.4*	*8.9*
Zinc absorption	%	*31%*	*30%*	*31%*	*32%*	*33%*	*33%*	*32%*	*32%*	*32%*	*31%*	*31%*	*30%*	*28%*	*26%*	*25%*	*25%*	*36%*	*30%*	*33%*	*32%*	*34%*	*34%*	*33%*	*33%*	*32%*	*31%*	*30%*	*28%*	*27%*	*26%*	*26%*
Water	g	2 780	3 099	3 163	2 564	2 797	2 500	2 500	2 500	2 501	2 500	2 500	2 500	2 500	2 500	4 569	4 988	2 422	2 914	3 532	2 909	2 250	2 219	2 235	2 182	2 213	2 151	2 163	2 041	2 000	3 861	4 154
Saturated fatty acids	% EI	**14%**	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	11%	10%	9%	6%	**15%**	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	11%	10%	8%	8%	7%
Atherogenic fatty acids	% EI	8%	8%	8%	8%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	6%	6%	3%	**9%**	8%	8%	8%	8%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	6%	5%	5%	4%
Linoleic acid	% EI	**3%**	5%	4%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	4%	5%	5%	**3%**	4%	4%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	5%	4%	5%	5%
α-linolenic acid	% EI	**0.0%**	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	**0.0%**	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%
Linoleic / α-linolenic	-	**8**	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	**7**	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5
EPA+DHA	g	**0.33**	0.71	0.72	0.73	0.66	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	**0.22**	0.67	0.67	0.66	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50
Sugar (excluding lactose)	g	**102**	100	100	98	98	100	96	100	100	100	100	98	75	73	84	100	80	100	100	81	79	79	80	82	85	88	85	75	74	83	96
Protein[5]	g	103	126	123	119	110	100	95	87	81	76	70	73	78	83	69	68	76	122	108	110	99	91	83	77	71	66	66	68	72	64	63
Fiber	g	**23**	30	30	30	33	35	37	37	38	39	40	43	49	55	50	49	**19**	30	30	30	31	32	33	34	34	35	37	40	44	44	44

[1]Observed data from the third Individual and National Study on Food Consumption French Survey (INCA3), n=1125 (564 males, 561 females).
[2]In the observed diets, the energy and nutrient intakes on a black background are those being outside the range of reference values. In the modeled diets, the intakes on a grey background are those being just equal to (one of) their reference values (i.e., equal to the lower or upper bounds of the nutritional constraints). No reference value or nutritional constraint was considered for vitamin D, as its reference value (15 µg/d) is known to be much too high to be reached through food intake alone [16,17].
[3]1 mg niacin equivalent (NE) is equal to 1 mg niacin or 60 mg tryptophan.
[4]For bioavailable iron and zinc, lower bounds were not based on current reference values but on lower threshold values ensuring ≤5% deficiency prevalences.
[5]To account for the slightly lower average digestibility of plant protein, protein intake from plants was reduced by 5% when calculating total protein intake.
Atherogenic fatty acids, lauric and myristic and palmitic acids; DHA, docosahexaenoic acid; EI, energy intake; EPA, eicosapentaenoic acid.

Supplemental Table 5. Food grouping: food groups and categories gathering food items consumed in the French INCA3 study.

Food category	Food groups (Number of food items per food group)
Processed meat	Processed meats (71)
Red meat	Beef and veal (40) Pork and other meats (39) Offal (19)
Poultry	Poultry (24)
Dairy products	Milk (15) Fresh natural dairy products (18) Fresh sweetened dairy products (39) Sweet milky desserts (22) Cheeses (98)
Eggs	Eggs and egg-based dishes (14)
Seafood	Oily fishes (32) Other fishes (55) Mollusks and crustaceans (21)
Fruit & vegetables	Vegetables (149) Fresh fruits (50) Dried fruits (9) Processed fruits: compotes and cooked fruits (13)
Legumes & nuts	Legumes (16) Nuts, seeds and oleaginous fruits (23)
Refined grain products	Bread and refined bakery products (36) Other refined starches (13)
Whole grain products	Wholemeal and semi-wholemeal bread and bakery products (15) Other complete and semi-complete starches (11)
Potatoes & starch	Starch-based products, sweet/fat processed (61) Salt/fat processed starch products (15) Potatoes and other tubers (20)
Added fats	Animal fats and assimilated fats (4) Butters and light butters (11) Vegetable fats rich in alpha-linoleic acid (4) Vegetable fats low in alpha-linoleic acid (24) Sauces and fresh creams (55)
Miscellaneous foods	Sweet products or Sweet and fatty products (198) Salt (6) Condiments (13) Aromatic herbs, Spices except salt (38) Soups (30) Bouillons (8) Substitutes of animal products (9) Other foods (14)
Sweetened beverages	Sweetened soda type drinks (45) Fruit juices (29)
Other drinks	Hot drinks (22) Drinking water (44) Alcoholic drinks (41)

Supplemental Table 6. Nutritional constraints applied in the optimization model in French males and females[1].

Nutrients	Units (/day)	Lower bounds[2]		Upper bounds[3]	
		Males	Females	Males	Females
Energy intake[4]	kcal	2 470	1 995	2 730	2 205
Retinol	µg	-	-	3 000	3 000
Vitamin A	µg	750	650	-	-
Vitamin B1 (Thiamin)	µg/kcal	0.418	0.418	-	-
Vitamin B2 (Riboflavin)	mg	1.6	1.6	-	-
Vitamin B3 (Niacin)[5]	mg NE/kcal	0.0067	0.0067	900	900
Vitamin B5 (Pantothenic acid)	mg	3.77	3.22	-	
Vitamin B6	mg	1.7	1.6	25	25
Vitamin B9 (Folate)	µg	330	330	-	-
Vitamin B12	µg	4	4	-	-
Vitamin C	mg	110	110	-	-
Vitamin D[6]	µg	-	-	100	100
Vitamin E	mg	5.28	4.37	-	-
Vitamin K1	µg	39.47	34.48	-	-
Calcium	mg	950	950	2 500	2 500
Copper	mg	1.07	0.89	5	5
Bioavailable iron[7]	mg	1.10 (1.40)	1.16 (1.49)	-	-
Iodine	µg	150	150	600	600
Magnesium	mg	253.5	194.6	-	-
Manganese	mg	1.99	1.52	-	-
Phosphorus	mg	550	550	-	-
Potassium	mg	3 500	3 500	-	-
Selenium	µg	70	70	300	300
Sodium	mg	1 500	1 500	2 300	2 300
Bioavailable zinc[7]	mg	2.06 (2.35)	1.61 (1.82)	25	25
Water	g	2 500	2 000	-	-
Saturated fatty acids	% EI	-	-	12%	12%
Atherogenic fatty acids	% EI	-	-	8%	8%
Linoleic acid	% EI	4%	4%	-	-
α-linolenic acid	% EI	1%	1%	-	-
Linoleic acid / alpha-linolenic acid ratio	-	-		5	5
EPA+DHA	g	0.5	0.5	-	-
Sugar (excluding lactose)	g	-		100	100
Protein[8]	g/kg bw	0.83	0.83	2.3	2.3
Fiber	g	30	30	-	-

[1]Lower and upper bounds of the nutritional constraints are based on the most recent nutrient reference values from the French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health and Safety (ANSES) [18].
[2]Lower bounds correspond to the Population Reference Intake (PRI) or lowest value of the macronutrient reference intake range. For vitamins B5, E, K1, copper, magnesium and manganese, lower bounds correspond to the 5th percentile of consumption.
[3]Upper bounds correspond to the Tolerable Upper Intake Level (UL) or highest value of the macronutrient reference intake range.
[4]Total energy intake was constrained to stay within ±5% of the current energy intake (2600 kcal for males and 2100 kcal for females).
[5]1 mg niacin equivalent (NE) is equal to 1 mg niacin or 60 mg tryptophan
[6]For vitamin D, a lower bound was not applied as the current reference value is too high to be reached through food intake alone.
[7]For bioavailable iron and zinc, lower bounds were not based on current reference values but on lower threshold values ensuring ≤5% deficiency prevalence. During sensitivity analysis, we also used the values shown in parentheses, which consider more demanding requirements thus ensuring ≤1% deficiency prevalence. These latter values are closer to current reference values, although still lower (but nevertheless higher than the currently observed values for bioavailable iron in females).
[8]To account for the slightly lower average digestibility of plant protein, protein intake from plants was reduced by 5% when calculating total protein intake.
Atherogenic fatty acids, lauric and myristic and palmitic acids; DHA, docosahexaenoic acid; EI, energy intake; EPA, eicosapentaenoic acid.

Supplemental Table 7. Dietary and acceptability constraints applied for the consumption of each food group in the optimization model in French males and females.

Food groups	Males			Females		
	Lower consumption limit (g/d)	Prevailing diet (g/d)	Upper consumption limit (g/d)	Lower consumption limit (g/d)[1]	Prevailing diet (g/d)	Upper consumption limit (g/d)
Unhealthy food groups (dietary constraints)[1]						
Beef and veal	0	48		0	28	
Pork and other meats	0	27	71*	0	13	71*
Offal	0	4		0	1	
Processed meats	0	50	25	0	30	25
Sweetened soda type beverages	0	141	263*	0	140	263*
Fruit juices	0	80		0	67	
Other food groups (acceptability constraints)[2]						
Vegetables	20	176	400	18	160	387
Fresh fruits	0	128		0	107	
Dried fruits	0	1	453*	0	1	359*
Processed fruits: compotes and cooked fruits	0	13		0	15	
Nuts, seeds and oleaginous fruits	0	3	20	0	2	14
Bread and refined bakery products	28	168	354*	19	115	316*
Complete and semi-complete bread and bakery products		11			15	
Other refined starches	0	98	276*	0	72	188*
Other complete and semi-complete starches	0	4		0	4	
Starch-based products, sweet/fat processed	0	22	97	0	19	82
Salt/fat processed starch products	0	4	21	0	2	14
Potatoes and other tubers	0	79	264	0	49	196
Legumes[3]	0	13	107	0	6	87
Poultry	0	30	108	0	31	109
Oily fishes[4]	0	8	39* (26 for oily)	0	6	39* (26 for oily)
Other fishes[4]	0	22		0	15	
Mollusks and crustaceans	0	5	28	0	4	26
Eggs and egg-based dishes	0	14	61	0	14	70
Milk[3]	0	84	486	0	75	393
Fresh natural dairy products	0	31	138	0	33	143
Fresh sweetened dairy products	0	50	179	0	48	168
Sweet milky desserts	0	19	93	0	16	73
Cheeses	0	49	131	0	36	94
Animal fats and assimilated fats[5]	1	1	1	0	0	0
Butters and light butters	0	10	33	0	10	30
Vegetable fats rich in ALA	0	0	32*	0	0	32*
Vegetable fats low in ALA	0	12		0	10	
Sauces and fresh creams	0	35	118	0	32	100
Sweet products or Sweet and fatty products	9	103	251	9	83	215
Salt	0	1	4	0	1	4
Condiments	0	4	29	0	3	21
Aromatic herbs, Spices except salt	0	2	7	0	2	6
Soups	0	71	434	0	75	381
Bouillons	0	5	21	0	4	25
Other foods[5]	4	4	4	2	2	2
Substitutes of animal products[6]	3	0	29	5	0	29
Drinking waters	182	1 007	-	75	929	-
Hot drinks[7]	0	494	494	0	507	507
Alcoholic drinks[7]	0	216	216	0	59	59
Liquids (sum of Milk, Drinking waters, Sweetened soda type drinks, Fruit juices, Hot drinks, Soups and Bouillons)	1 061	2 098	3 777	738	1857	3 087

*These upper consumption limits correspond to coupled constraints for the groups mentioned (e.g., 71 g/d is the maximum intake for beef and veal, pork and other meats and offal grouped together).

[1]In the dietary constraints, upper bounds were applied to the food groups for which the consumption needed to be limited, in line with the French dietary guidelines [16].

[2]In the acceptability constraints, lower and upper consumption limits generally represented the 5th and 95th percentiles of consumption, respectively, of the food group in males and females, calculated using data from the third Individual and National Study on Food Consumption French Survey (INCA3), n=1125 (564 males, 561 females).

[3]For legumes and milk, the upper consumption limits in each sex were raised to their theoretical minimum-risk exposure level (TMREL) values as their 95th percentiles of consumption values were slightly lower (86 g/day and 43 g/day for legumes and 343 g/day and 322 g/day for milk in males and females, respectively).

[4]For fish, in order to take account of sustainable fish consumption and to limit exposure to contaminants, and in line with the French dietary guidelines on fish consumption [19], total fish consumption was limited to 39 g/day and oily fish consumption was limited to 26 g/day.

[5]For animal fats and assimilated fats and other foods, consumptions have been imposed constant and equal to the observed intakes in the modeled diets.

[6]For animal product substitutes, due to the very low value of the 95th percentile of consumption in men, their upper bound was set to the corresponding value in females.

[7]For hot and alcoholic drinks, the upper bound was set at the prevailing consumption.

Supplemental Table 8. Theoretical minimum-risk exposure level (TMREL) and disability-adjusted life-years (DALYs) values used in the optimization model in French males and females.

		TMREL[1] (g/d)		DALYs[2] (y)	
		Males	Females	Males	Females
Unhealthy foods	Red meat	0	0	28 562	20 824
	Processed meat	0	0	14 346	6 288
	Sweetened beverages	0	0	4 105	1 791
Healthy foods	Whole grains	170	137	31 405	10 987
	Fruit	367	297	20 130	9 512
	Legumes	107	87	17 103	3 386
	Vegetables	339	274	9 342	3 090
	Nuts & seeds	16	13	6 531	1 355
	Milk	486	393	3 521	2 727
	Sum			135 045	59 961

[1]According to the most recent (2019) estimates from the GBD, the TMREL values are 0 g/d for red meat, processed meat and sweetened beverages, and 150, 325, 95, 300, 14.5 and 430 g/d, respectively, for whole cereal products, fruits, legumes, vegetables, nuts and seeds, and milk [20]. As these TMREL values are overall estimates corresponding to a mean energy intake of 2300 kcal [20], we used sex-specific values adapted to the particular energy intake of males and females in our French adult population (centered around 2600 kcal and 2100 kcal in males and females, respectively).

[2]We used the most recent (2019) French sex-specific DALYs values associated with excessive/insufficient consumption of unhealthy/healthy foods, available from the Global Health Data Exchange website (http://ghdx.healthdata.org/gbd-results-tool).



Supplemental Figure 1. Daily food category consumption in the observed diets (obs) and modeled diets obtained by long-term health risk (*HR*) and diet departure (*DD*) minimization under imposed percentage of plant protein in the diet (%PP) in French males and females. Results are reported for all the adequate %PP values ensuring nutrient adequacy (16%-82% in males and 16%-77% in females), which includes those also ensuring a null HR value (25%-70% in both sexes). The bar charts represent the cumulative consumptions of food categories (black axis on the left), and the curves represent the HR and DD values (blue and pink axes on the right, respectively). For clarity, the 45 modeled food groups are not represented here but grouped into broader categories that are included in HR (such as red and processed meats) or represent other protein sources (such as poultry and seafood). Consumptions of water, hot beverages, alcohol and miscellaneous foods are not shown, for clarity. Details about food grouping and consumptions of food categories not shown here are given in Supplemental Tables 5 and 2, respectively.



Supplemental Figure 2. Daily food category consumption in the observed diets (obs) and modeled diets obtained by long-term health risk (*HR*) and diet departure minimization under imposed percentage of plant protein in the diet (%PP) in French males, females and all adults. Results are reported for all the adequate %PP values ensuring nutrient adequacy and model convergence, of which only the 25%-70% range ensured a null *HR* value. The bar charts represent cumulative consumption of the main animal-based or plant-based food categories. Details about food grouping and consumptions of food categories not shown here are given in Supplemental Tables 5 and 2, respectively.



Supplemental Figure 3. Relative contribution of food categories to protein intake (in % of total protein intake) in the observed diets (obs) and modeled diets obtained by long-term health risk (*HR*) and diet departure minimization under imposed percentage of plant protein in the diet (%PP) in French adults. Results are reported for all the adequate %PP values ensuring nutrient adequacy and model convergence, of which only the 25%-70% range ensured a null *HR* value. See Supplemental Table 5 for the detailed composition of food categories.



Supplemental Figure 4. Contribution of food categories to intakes of nutrients that are limiting for a high plant protein percentage in the diet (%PP ≥ 75%) in observed (obs) and modeled diets obtained by long-term health risk (*HR*) and diet departure minimization under imposed %PP value in French adults. Results are reported for all the adequate %PP values ensuring nutrient adequacy and model convergence, of which only the 25%-70% range ensured a null *HR* value. The line represents the constraint for the selected nutrient (lower bound, except for sodium that is upper bound). For bioavailable iron and vitamin A, constraints are represented as the mean between the constraint for males and females. For other nutrients, constraints are similar between sexes. See Supplemental Table 6 for the detailed values of the constraints, and Supplemental Table 5 for the detailed composition of food categories.



Supplemental Figure 5. Contribution of food categories to the intakes of nutrients that are limiting for a low plant protein percentage in the diet (%PP ≤ 20%) in observed (obs) and modeled diets obtained by long-term health risk (*HR*) and diet departure minimization under imposed %PP value in French adults. Results are reported for all the adequate %PP values ensuring nutrient adequacy and model convergence, of which only the 25%-70% range ensured a null *HR* value. The line represents the constraint for the selected nutrient (upper bound, except for fiber that is lower bound). See Supplemental Table 5 for the detailed composition of food categories. Atherogenic fatty acids, lauric and myristic and palmitic acids.



Supplemental Figure 6. Land use (A), fossils resource use (B), water use (C) and single environmental footprint score aggregating 16 indicators (D) associated with the observed (obs) and modeled diets obtained by long-term health risk (*HR*) and diet departure minimization under imposed percentage of plant protein in the diet (%PP) in French adults. Results are reported for all the adequate %PP values ensuring nutrient adequacy and model convergence, of which only the 25%-70% range ensured a null *HR* value. Sections inside the bars represent the contributions of food categories to the considered environmental indicator, and values above the bars represent the percentage deviation in the environmental indicator from its observed value. See Supplemental Table 5 for the detailed composition of food categories.

References

1 de Gavelle, E., Huneau, J. F., Bianchi, C. M., Verger, E. O. & Mariotti, F. Protein Adequacy Is Primarily a Matter of Protein Quantity, Not Quality: Modeling an Increase in Plant:Animal Protein Ratio in French Adults. *Nutrients* **9**, doi:10.3390/nu9121333 (2017).

2 The French Meat Information Center & INRAE. *Nutritional values of meats* (2009); http://www.lessentieldesviandes-pro.org/pdf/PDF-tous%20morceaux.pdf.

3 U.S. Department of Agriculture – Agricultural Research Service. *FoodData Central* (2021); http://ndb.nal.usda.gov.

4 The French Agency for Food Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety (ANSES). *ANSES-CIQUAL French food composition table* (version 2016); https://ciqual.anses.fr/.

5 Colomb, V. *et al.* AGRIBALYSE (R), the French LCI Database for agricultural products: high quality data for producers and environmental labelling. *Ocl-Oilseeds and Fats Crops and Lipids* **22**, doi:10.1051/ocl/20140047 (2015).

6 ISO 14040. *Management environnemental — Analyse du cycle de vie — Principes et cadre* (2006); https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/fr/#iso:std:iso:14040:ed-2:v1:fr.

7 ISO 14044. *Management environnemental — Analyse du cycle de vie — Exigences et lignes directrices* (2006); https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/fr/#iso:std:iso:14044:ed-1:v1:fr.

8 Livestock Environmental Assessment and Performance (LEAP). *Partnership - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations*; https://www.fao.org/partnerships/leap/overview/the-partnership/en/.

9 European Commission. *Guidance for the development of Product Environmental Footprint Category Rules (PEFCRs)* (version 6.3, 2018); https://ec.europa.eu/environment/eussd/smgp/pdf/PEFCR_guidance_v6.3.pdf.

10 Gac, A. *et al.* GES'TIM – des apports pour l'évaluation environnementale des activités agricoles. *Innovations Agronomiques* **17** (2011).

11 Nemecek, T. & Kägi, T. *Life Cycle Inventories of Agricultural Production Systems* (Final report ecoinvent, Swiss Centre for Life Cycle Inventories, 2007); Available from: https://db.ecoinvent.org/reports/15_Agriculture.pdf.

12 Koch, P. & Salou, T. *AGRIBALYSE®: Rapport Méthodologique - Volet Agriculture - Version 3.0* (ADEME, 2020); Available from: www.ademe.fr/agribalyse-en.

13 Afnor. *BP X30-323-5* (2011); https://www.boutique.afnor.org/fr-fr/norme/bp-x303235/principes-generaux-pour-laffichage-environnemental-des-produits-de-grande-c/fa183524/43350.

14 Asselin-Balençon, A. *et al. AGRIBALYSE v3.0 : the French agricultural and food LCI database. Methodology for the food products.* (ADEME, 2020);

15 Joint FAO/WHO/UNU Expert Consultation on Protein and Amino Acid Requirements in Human Nutrition. *Protein and amino acid requirements in human nutrition : report of a joint FAO/WHO/UNU expert consultation* (World Health Organization, 2002); https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/43411.

16 Mariotti, F. *et al.* Perspective: Modeling Healthy Eating Patterns for Food-Based Dietary Guidelines-Scientific Concepts, Methodological Processes, Limitations, and Lessons. *Adv Nutr* **12**, 590-599, doi:10.1093/advances/nmaa176 (2021).

17 Dussiot, A. *et al.* Modeled healthy eating patterns are largely constrained by currently estimated requirements for bioavailable iron and zinc - a diet optimization study in French Adults. *The American journal of clinical nutrition*, doi:10.1093/ajcn/nqab373 (2021).

18 The French Agency for Food Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety (ANSES). *Avis de l'Agence nationale de sécurité sanitaire de l'alimentation, de l'environnement et du travail relatif à « Actualisation des références nutritionnelles françaises en vitamines et minéraux »* (saisine n°2018-SA-0238, saisine liée n°2012-SA-0103, 2021); https://www.anses.fr/fr/system/files/NUT2018SA0238Ra.pdf.

19 The French Agency for Food Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety (ANSES). *Opinion of the French Food Safety Agency on the benefits/risks of fish consumption* (saisine n°2008-SA-0123, 2008); https://www.anses.fr/fr/system/files/RCCP2008sa0123.pdf.

20 GBD Risk Factors Collaborators. Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet* **396**, 1223-1249, doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30752-2 (2020).